

1 **WO**

2
3
4
5
6 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
7 **FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**
8

9 Richard Rivera,
10 Plaintiff,

11 v.

12 David Shinn, et al.,
13 Defendants.
14

No. CV-23-01014-PHX-KML (ASB)

ORDER

15 Non-party Carmina Carrasco filed a motion for temporary restraining order that
16 would require Richard Rivera receive copies of legal documents “in timely manner,”
17 “sufficient weekly showers,” “adequate medical care” related to an infected leg, and a
18 “JPay tablet.” (Doc. 79 at 1.) Defendants filed a response and motion to strike. (Doc. 81.)
19 According to defendants, Carrasco is not authorized to represent Rivera and the motion
20 should be stricken on that basis. Defendants also argue the underlying claims in this suit
21 involve medical care for Rivera’s retinal detachment and Carrasco’s motion impermissibly
22 seeks injunctive relief unrelated to the claims at issue. (Doc. 5 at 11.)

23 “While a non-attorney may appear pro se on his own behalf, [h]e has no authority
24 to appear as an attorney for others than himself.” *Johns v. Cnty. of San Diego*, 114 F.3d
25 874, 876 (9th Cir. 1997) (simplified). Carrasco therefore cannot appear and seek relief on
26 Rivera’s behalf. But even if Carrasco could, “there must be a relationship between the
27 injury claimed in the motion for injunctive relief and the conduct asserted in the underlying
28 complaint.” *Pac. Radiation Oncology, LLC v. Queen’s Med. Ctr.*, 810 F.3d 631, 636 (9th

1 Cir. 2015). The motion seeks relief unrelated to the retinal detachment alleged in the
2 complaint.

3 Accordingly,

4 **IT IS ORDERED** the Motion for Temporary Restraining Order (Doc. 79) is
5 **DENIED**.

6 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** the Motion to Strike (Doc. 81) is **DENIED AS**
7 **MOOT**.

8 Dated this 5th day of June, 2025.

9
10 
11 _____
12 **Honorable Krissa M. Lanham**
13 **United States District Judge**
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28